

Scoring Sheet - US 46/US 68 Intersection Improvements - LOI for Construction Inspection

Date: 3/26/2019

PID 103793

Name of Scorer: (three scorers' numbers combined)

CHP-US36-14.88

| Category | Total Value | Scoring Criteria | DLZ Corp. Score | American Structurepoint, Inc. Score | Quality Control Inspection Score | AECOM Score | True Inspection Services, LLC Score |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Management & Team | | | | | | | |
| Project Inspector | 10 | See Note 1, Exhibit 1 | 8.67 | 9.33 | 10.00 | 8.00 | 8.33 |
| Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Construction Engineer Level 1 and Subconsultants | 25 | See Note 2, Exhibit 1 | 21.67 | 24.00 | 23.33 | 20.67 | 22.33 |
| Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel | 10 | See Note 3, Exhibit 1 | 8.00 | 9.00 | 4.67 | 8.33 | 10.00 |
| Consultant's Past Performance | 30 | See Note 4, Exhibit 1 | 27.00 | 28.33 | 27.33 | 22.33 | 26.00 |
| Project Approach | 25 | | 22.00 | 23.67 | 18.33 | 22.00 | 25.00 |
| Total | 100 | | 87.33 | 94.33 | 83.67 | 81.33 | 91.67 |

Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes

1) The proposed project inspector for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project inspector receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project inspectors receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project inspector's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project inspector's role in the success of a given project. The project inspector's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project inspector.

2) The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3) The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

4) The consultant's past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team may consult other agencies as appropriate.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.